

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1 and 2.

Figures 1 and 2 have been designated by a legend "Prior Art"

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed March 9, 2007. Applicant's election of claims 1-10 filed on November 13, 2006 was based on the requirement that an election must be made to fully response to the Restriction Requirement. Concurrent with the filing, Applicant advised the USPTO of the error in the Restriction requirement, but unfortunately, the error was not corrected before the first Office Action.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner to reissue an Office Action directed to the pending claims 14-32.

Amendments to the Drawings

The Office Action states that Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend "Prior Art". Applicant respectfully submits the amended Figures 1 and 2 and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Double Patenting

The Office Action states that claims 1-10 are rejected based on a non-statutory, obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Since claims 14-32 are pending, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection based on his review of pending claims 14-32.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action states that claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection based on the fact that claims 1-10 are not pending. Rather, claims 14-32 (as shown above) are pending in the subject application.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.